

Article

Conflict and Computation on Wikipedia: a Finite-State Machine Analysis of Editor Interactions

Simon DeDeo^{1,2,3,4*}

¹ Center for Complex Networks and Systems Research, Department of Informatics, Indiana University, 919 E 10th St, Bloomington, IN 47408, USA

² Program in Cognitive Science, Indiana University, 1900 E 10th St, Bloomington, IN 47406, USA

³ Ostrom Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, 513 N Park Avenue, Bloomington, IN 47408, USA

⁴ Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; sdedeo@indiana.edu, telephone (812) 856-2855, fax (812) 856-3825

Version June 5, 2022. Typeset by *LaTeX* using class file *mdpi.cls*

Abstract: What is the boundary between a vigorous argument and a breakdown of relations? What drives a group of individuals across it? Taking Wikipedia as a test case, we use a hidden Markov model to approximate the computational structure and social grammar of more than a decade of cooperation and conflict among its editors. Across a wide range of pages, we discover a bursty war/peace structure where the systems can become trapped—sometimes for months—in a computational subspace associated with high levels of rapid-fire conflict. Distinct patterns of behavior sustain the low-conflict subspace, including tit-for-tat reversion. While a fraction of the transitions between these subspaces are associated with top-down actions taken by administrators, the effects are weak and of uncertain valence. Surprisingly, we find no statistical signal that transitions are associated with the appearance of particularly anti-social users, and only weak association with significant news events outside the system. The majority of transitions between high and low conflict states appear to be driven by decentralized processes with no clear locus of control. Our results show how, in a modern sociotechnical system, memory of conflict is delocalized, and conflict management is a bottom-up process. It suggests that policy-makers may be limited in their ability to manage conflict, and that bad actors and exogenous shocks are less effective in causing conflict than is generally believed.

Keywords: conflict; finite-state machine; social grammar; tit-for-tat; bursty; hidden Markov model; memory; social norms; knowledge commons; Wikipedia

Many societies are characterized by periods of peace separated by significant intra-group conflict. What triggers this kind of conflict? Can it be predicted before it happens? We know something about what might make a peace fragile, or a social system prone to internal division and civil war (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [1,2]), but we understand much less about the proximate causes: what caused a particular conflict to break out when it did.

The limitations of our knowledge are not just of scholarly interest; because we know so little about these proximate causes of conflict, we are limited in our abilities to intervene to prevent it. We understand war and peace each on its own terms; but the transitions between them remain poorly understood. Historical accounts of intra-group conflict often involve narratives of external shocks or internal opposition to dominant norms. Meanwhile, the removal of an external stress, and the reconstitution of state control are celebrated at a conflict's end. All of these features can be found, for example, in classic work on social revolution on the very largest scales [3], which emphasizes the study of revolutions as complex objects of explanation (Ref. [4], pg. 6) and urges attention to the particularities of events.

Alternative explanations for internal instability and phase changes, most recently those inspired by the biological and physical sciences, draw on tools from catastrophe theory, critical bifurcations, and phase transitions [5,6]. They focus on the unusual and potentially chaotic dynamics that emerge from the interaction of large numbers of heterogeneously-coupled units. These accounts are often mechanism-neutral and focus on abstract properties of a time-series of events. In the literature on critical transitions, for example, one looks for properties such as spatial correlation [7], critical slowing-down [8], or flickering [9], and can apply their logic to clinical depression just as well as ecosystem collapse [10].

These two perspectives are distinct. The first is narrative and focused on mechanism and cause. The second is dynamical and predictive, working with real-valued quantities, and describing systems as moving over a continuous landscape.

Here, we propose a third perspective that draws the first two together to describe social systems in terms of how they process information. We focus on measuring and interpreting computational properties of the system such as memory and predictability. As we shall show, a system's computational process—how it moves through an abstract state space that both responds to the past and predicts its own future—connects directly to social properties that are immediately perceptible to human participants. In its focus on discrete states, rather than continuous fields, our work is complementary to the tradition of Ref. [5]. It can be thought of as the extension of linguistics to the construction of collectively-implemented social grammars [11].

The social system surrounding the website Wikipedia is an ideal case for the study of the computational properties of conflict. By design, actions on the system are logged at extremely high resolution, allowing us to track the actions and interactions of tens of thousands of users second-by-second for nearly fifteen years. The volume of data makes it possible to model the information processing of the system itself, an approach becoming increasingly common in large-scale studies of social media (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [12]). At the same time, ethnographic and quantitative studies of the

system [13] help us interpret individual actions, users, and their social contexts, and allow us to test narrative accounts of the causes and patterns of conflict.

As we shall show, computational analysis of Wikipedian conflict reveals large-scale patterns associated with high and low-levels of conflict. By pin-pointing the transitions between these two coarse-grained computational states, we can study the influence of administrative actions, individual users, and exogenous events over this society’s history. We will see how apparently abstract properties, including the underlying configuration of computational states, are tied to human-scale and group level properties that form the basis of the system’s self-understanding. And we will see how large-scale phenomena—weeks and months of conflict—are driven by the patterns of microevents that unfold second by second.

1. Methods

When editors interact on Wikipedia, they can disagree on what to do and how to behave. The resulting conflicts that emerge can be tracked by reference to “reverts”. Reverts are when one user takes a page to a previously-seen state, effectively undoing and discarding the work of others. More qualitative, interpretive measures of conflict among users are strongly associated with these easily-tracked reverts [14].

We consider conflict among editors editing the same page, and track sixty-two of the most-edited pages. For each page, the edit time-series was coarse-grained into “revert” (R) and non-revert (C) actions as described in Refs. [15]; features of this classification, and additional robustness checks, are described in Ref. [16].

1.1. Computational Modelling

For each page, we have a binary time-series of Wikipedian conflict, consisting of Rs and Cs. Page-by-page, we approximate this time-series as a probabilistic finite state machine, more commonly known as a Hidden Markov Model (HMM). Each page is associated with a distinct machine. The internal states of a HMM approximate the underlying optimal predictive states of the original process. The system moves from one hidden state to another from moment to moment; depending on its state at any particular time, it will produce an observed behavior (here, R or C), and transition to a new internal state in a probabilistic fashion.

We find the parameters for the HMM associated with the time-series on each page using the Expectation-Maximization algorithm [17]; for each page, we run this hill-climbing algorithm 3,200 times with random initial seeds to study the ruggedness of the underlying likelihood landscape. We model pages with up to twelve hidden states, and use AIC to select the preferred model; for simplicity, and in keeping with usual practice, we work solely with the maximum-likelihood model rather than attempting to model the full distribution over distinct, but less-preferred, models.

In general, as the system evolves, it will spread out over its internal state space. A characteristic feature of this spreading out is the so-called trapping time: how long the system stays confined in a particular subspace of its possible internal states. Once the best-fit HMM has been determined, we can

determine trapping time by reference to the second eigenvalue of the transition matrix, λ_2 . We define trapping time, τ , as

$$\tau = -\frac{1}{|\ln \lambda_2|}. \quad (1)$$

Informally, τ is the expected number of time-steps for a system to explore the full state space, given arbitrary starting conditions; it is also known as the mixing time. When λ_2 is very close to unity (small spectral gap), the trapping time becomes very long. This can be understood by writing down an approximation for the probability that the system will be found in a particular state at time t , $\vec{v}(t)$,

$$\vec{v}(t) \propto v^{(1)} + \alpha v^{(2)} \lambda_2^t + \dots, \quad (2)$$

$$= v^{(1)} + \alpha v^{(2)} e^{-t/\tau} + \dots \quad (3)$$

where $v^{(1)}$ is the stationary distribution of the chain, equal to the first eigenvector of the transition matrix, $v^{(2)}$ is the second eigenvector, and α depends upon the initial conditions. The remaining terms are exponentially suppressed relative to $v^{(2)}$.

The second eigenvector, $v^{(2)}$, describes the perturbation that takes the longest time to die away. It allows us to split the system into two subspaces based on the signs of its entries. One set of states is associated with the positive $v^{(2)}$ values; the complementary set with those that are strictly negative. Informally, initial conditions that are weighted towards one of these sets take the longest to decay to the stationary distribution. It is these two spaces that will define the system epochs.

We can characterize each subspace by the probability of an R vs. C emission averaged over all states within the subspace. We call the subspace with higher probability of reverts the ‘‘high-conflict’’ subspace. We can characterize the relative propensity for conflict in the two subspaces by κ , the ratio over the average level of conflict between the two spaces.

Once we know the parameters of the HMM, we can use Viterbi path reconstruction [18] to reconstruct the maximum-likelihood path through the state space. We then know, at any point in the time-series, where we are in the underlying computational state space.

This allows us to associate a internal state of the HMM to each step in the time-series, and thus to each edit on the page itself. We can study time spent within each subspace, as well as pinpoint when a transition from one subspace to the other occurs. When a system switches subspaces, there can be some flickering, with rapid shifting back and forth between subspaces before the system settles down. We only count a transition from one subspace to another when the system remains in the new subspace for more than ten time-steps.

Subspaces are defined by more than just their levels of conflict. What distinguishes them are the relationships between their conditional probabilities, which make some sequences more likely than others. System response to a revert will be different, and lead to different characteristic futures, in one subspace, compared to the other. We characterize subspaces by reference to the relative frequency of motifs: short sequences of system behaviors. We consider the distribution of motifs when the system is in each subspace; we then rank motifs by reference to their partial-KL from the mixture distribution [19]. A motif i is characteristic of a subspace if the quantity $p_i \log p_i / m_i$ is large, where p_i is the probability of the motif in the subspace, and m_i is the probability of the motif overall. Partial-KL provides an information theoretic measure of the extent to which a particular motif is a signal of the underlying subspace [20].

1.2. Causes of State Transitions

Given an identification of transition points, we return to the original time-series to catalog features of the system at these critical points, and to determine potential causes for the transition. We consider three types of potential causes. In all three cases, we look for associations between these potential causes, and transitions between subspaces. An association is defined as a potential cause occurring within a particular time window of a transition event.

First, we track *page protection events*, points at which administrators changed the access permissions of the page to either prevent or allow different user classes to edit the page. Records of page protection events are reliably logged beginning on 10 November 2003. We expect page protection events to be the main source of top-down control that can switch the system between trapping subspaces. We can characterize a protection event as “hard” when it leads to a restriction on user editing; “soft”, when it releases the page from a restriction. The bulk of protection events are in shifting the page between “anyone can edit” and “semi-protected”; the latter restricts edits to users who have been registered for a sufficient number of days, and have made a sufficient number of edits on other pages.

Second, we track *anti-social user events*. Transitions between subspaces may, potentially, be induced by unusually anti-social users who instigate self-sustaining conflict by—for example—publically violating norms of interaction. Rather than define an externally-imposed standard that may not reflect the reality of online interaction, we define anti-sociality by reference to community norms, as expressed by so-called user blocking events. Wikipedia administrators are able to block users from editing for a period of time. Receiving a block is a signal that one has (in the opinion of at least one administrator) violated a community norm.

We define a user as anti-social in the context of a particular page if that user has a blocking rate (number of blocks per total number of edits) higher than 95% of randomly-selected editors on the same page. For any transition, we check to see if the user with the most edits within a certain window meets this anti-social criterion; if so, we consider this a potential explanation of the transition. This provides a quantitative measure of the extent of internal opposition to dominant norms.


Finally, we track *major external events*; transition dates associated with major events concerning the topic of the page itself, and defined as significant increases in news coverage for the article subject.

To do this, we rely on two well-curated, public databases—the New York Times archives, and the Guardian API¹—and track sudden increases in the density of news coverage. We quantify news spikes by reference to the rate of articles in a four-day window around the position in question, and define a major external event as one that leads to a fluctuation in this ratio over and above the null rate at 95% confidence.

Time-series data, including both raw data and the coarse-grained R-C series, resultant best-fit HMMs, and code for both EM estimation of Markov Chains and for Viterbi reconstruction are available online as the package SFIHMM.²

¹ <http://developer.nytimes.com>; <http://open-platform.theguardian.com>

² Package to be released on publication; contact simon@santafe.edu.



Page Behavior	. . . CRCRRRCCCCRRRCCCC	RCRCRCRCRCRCRCRRRR . . .
Internal State	. . . 593939555559395555	8484848484848480707 . . .

Figure 1. Hidden Markov Model for cooperation and conflict on the George W. Bush page. States are labelled by output symbol; C ($P(C) > 0.8$), R ($P(R) > 0.8$) or cr (otherwise). Edge weights show transition probabilities; the lightest lines, connecting the two subspaces, correspond to probabilities of order 10^{-4} . Despite its complexity, the system is dominated by a transition logic that, on short timescales, confines the system to one of two separate modules with a high density of internal transitions. Below the diagram, as an example of our method, we show the Viterbi reconstruction in the neighborhood of one of the sixteen between-subspace transitions in our data. On November 8th, 2004 at 9:11 UTC, long runs of cooperation and conflict gave way to more rapid-fire conflict and vandal-repair as the system crossed from the left module to the right, via the bridge between state 5 and state 8.

2. Results

For all sixty-two pages, the EM algorithm converged and we were able to find best-fit hidden Markov models. For the majority of pages (56 of 62), model selection preferred models with at least six internal states.

The network of transitions between states were sparse; any internal state had significantly non-zero transition probabilities to only a small number of others. States themselves usually had near-deterministic emission rules; a particular state usually had near-unity probability of emitting one of the two possible R or C symbols. Informally, this implies the existence of a variety of interaction motifs, particular patterns of Rs and Cs, at the multi-symbol level.

An example of the underlying computation process for a page is shown in Fig. 1, for the most-edited page in Wikipedia, that associated with George W. Bush. The sparseness of the internal state connectivity can be seen in the small number of high-probability transitions for each node; the determinism of the internal states from the fact that nearly all states are strongly biased, at least 80-20, towards one or other of the two symbols. Also clearly visible is the modular structure of the hidden system; most transitions occur within one of two clearly separated subsets of the states. Over the course of nearly fifteen years and 45,448 edits, the page switched between these two subspaces only sixteen times; we show the time-series




Figure 2. Trapping time, τ , for the sixty-two pages in our sample (solid line). Trapping times are exceptionally long, an average of 698 steps, and on average a factor of 50 times longer than expected for Markov models with similar sparseness (dotted line). The longest trapping times are for the pages associated with the Gaza War, the Russo-Georgian War, and the page describing Wikipedia itself.

surrounding one switch, which happened on November 8th, 2004. Distinct, repeated motifs can be seen, informally, across the transition; we discuss these more below.

2.1. Epoch Detection

The distribution of trapping times, τ , is shown in Fig. 2. For all sixty-two pages, τ is exceptionally long. The average trapping time in our sample is 698 steps, corresponding to a λ_2 of roughly $1 - 10^{-3}$; the median is 287 steps. In all cases, it is significantly different from the null, and the effect size is large; the median trapping time for the null model is only 12 steps, and for any particular page, the observed trapping time is on average 50 times longer than the null expectation.

Using Viterbi reconstruction, we can infer the actual transitions that occur on the pages. Coarse-graining subspace transitions to remove flickering, we find a total of 1,390 transition events over the sixty-two pages. The average residency time, page-by-page, is 1,201 steps, or 190 days. Residency times are longer than τ , in part because we eliminate flickering. Epoch switching events do not appear to be concentrated at any special range of time in the last fifteen years; the distribution of switching times is indistinguishable, in a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, from the distribution of edit times in general.

The two subspaces have distinct levels of expected conflict; on average, the high-conflict subspace is roughly 2.5 times more conflict-prone than the low-conflict subspace. This justifies our description of the two subspaces as “high” and “low” conflict. Residency times are also slightly longer in the high-conflict state (207 days vs. 149 days).




Figure 3. Distribution of edit rates for high and low-conflict subspaces. Shown here, as an example, the spacing between edits on the George W. Bush page. When the system is in the high-conflict subspace, edits occur once every 212 seconds (median; 3.5 minutes); in the low-conflict subspace, once every 951 seconds, or every 16 minutes. When the system is in the high-conflict subspace, users almost never wait more than a day to take action.

When the system is trapped in the high-conflict subspace, we find that editing accelerates. The spacing between edits declines, and users edit on average 2.6 times faster. An example of the distribution of edit timescales is shown in Fig. 3, for the case of the George W. Bush page; when the system is in the high-conflict subspace, edits occur almost every three minutes, compared to once every 14 minutes in the low-conflict subspace. Other differences appear; 37% of edits are made by unregistered users (“IP addresses”) in the high-conflict subspace, compared to 21% of edits in the low-conflict subspace.

As can be seen in the sample Viterbi reconstruction in Fig. 1, the transition from one state to the other is characterized by more than just an increase in revert-rate. High- and low-conflict subspaces are characterized by very different interaction styles. Table 1 shows the characteristic motifs over the full set of 62 pages. As expected, the low-conflict subspaces are distinguished by runs of cooperation; however, they are also, unexpectedly, distinguished by runs of reverts. When reverts follow each other, they are usually part of an edit war [14], involving a small number of users repeatedly undoing each other’s work in a tit-for-tat pattern.

Conversely, vandalism (when a user inserts patently offensive or nonsense content into a page) followed by a (pro-social) revert is one of the characteristics of the high-conflict subspace; the vandal appears as a C move, and the pro-social repair as R. CR events are roughly 2.7 times as common when the system is in the high-conflict subspace, and edit comments that report vandalism (using the keywords “vandal” or the shorthand “rvv”) are 1.9 times as common.

Not all CR motifs are simple vandalism, however. The underlying CR pattern is simply a rejected proposal; repeated CRs in a timeseries is a signature of repeated rejection of different proposals. As an example, we take a (randomly chosen) short period when the Hillary Clinton page is in the high-conflict subspace.³ Of the eighty edits of that epoch, there are twelve CR pairs; six of them revert simple vandalism (introduction of sexual slurs), while five involve rejection of content that was contributed by a single editor apparently acting in good faith, and one is ambiguous.

CR motifs are a significant source of the higher levels of system conflict: while 28% of all edits in the high-conflict subspace are reverts, only 8% of reverts remain once CR motifs are dropped. Removing CR motifs, however, increases the relative rates of conflict; the high-conflict subspace has 2.7 times more reverts than the low-conflict subspace when CR pairs are removed, compared to 2.5 in the base condition. When comparing conflict rates between the subspaces, the residue is worse than the mixture.

Transitions are not accompanied by significant population shifts. On average, 20.2% of the users that have appeared in the 100 edits just prior to a transition point also appear in the 100 edits just following. This is, in fact, slightly higher than the persistence we expect across an arbitrary point (17.7%) in our data. Transitions to the high (or low) conflict subspace are not associated with unusual rates of turnover.

2.2. Drivers of Conflict Transitions

³ See https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Hillary_Clinton&offset=20070217204656&limit=87&action=history; the system entered the high-conflict subspace on 8 February 2007, 09:21 UTC, and left on 17 February 2007, 20:14 UTC.

Table 1. Characteristic motifs of the high and low-conflict subspaces across all 62 pages, ranked by partial-KL. The low-conflict subspace is characterized by long runs of cooperation, but also by long runs of reversion. Conversely, the high-conflict subspace is characterized by more rapid patterns of alternation between R and C moves.

Size	Low-Conflict Motifs	High-Conflict Motifs
2	CC, RR	CR, RC
3	CCC, RRR, RRC, CRR	CRC, RCR, RCC, CCR
4	CCCC, RRRR, RRCC, RCRR, CRRC	RCRC, CRCR, CRCC, CCRC, RCCR
5	CCCCC, RRCRR, RRRRR, CRRRR, RRRRC	CRCRC, RCRCR, RCRCC, CCRCR, CRCCR

For the three event types that may be causal drivers of the transition to or from the high-conflict state—page protection, anti-social user, and external events—there are three potentially relevant questions:

1. How many events are there, and what fraction are associated with a transition? (Effectiveness)
2. What fraction of transitions are associated with an event? (Explanatory Power)
3. For those transitions that we can associate with an event, what fraction have the expected effect? (Valence)

Item 1 we consider a measure of event *effectiveness*; an event type that more often leads to a transition is more effective. Item 2 we consider the extent to which an event type can *explain* an observed transition; if more transitions are associated with such an event type, that type is the more influential in explaining state switching. Item 3, *valence*, measures the extent to which the event has the expected effect; when an administrator locks a page, for example, it is natural to assume that the goal is to push the system out of a high-conflict state. Measures of valence only make sense when an event type is effective or has explanatory power.

These measures should be kept distinct, just as they are, for example, in the testing of a new drug. Taking a drug may correlate with a change in the patient’s symptoms (apparent effect); a patient’s symptoms may fluctuate independently of her use of the drug (low explanatory power); the drug may increase, rather than reduce, the severity of the symptoms (wrong valence).

2.2.1. Page Protection Events

Administrators can exercise direct control over who edits a page. These page protection events are the primary mechanism for authorities to influence the patterns of editing on the page; they are a blunt and top-down instrument that restricts editing on a particular page to increasingly smaller populations (“hard” protection), or, conversely, opens it up to the wider community (“soft” protection events). Releasing a page from protection can occur by explicit action or by default, when a prior restriction is given an expiration date.

Page protection is mostly *ineffective* in inducing a transition. Of the 1,545 protection events in our data, only 136 (8.8%) occur within ten edits of a transition event; while the effect is statistically significant (35, or 2.3% expected; $p < 10^{-3}$), the effect size is small.

Page protection *can explain some*, but far from all, transition events. There are 1,387 transition events that we can, potentially, associate with a page protection;⁴ thus, at most, about 9.8% of observed transitions can be associated with page protections (2.5% expected; $p < 10^{-3}$).

Norms on the encyclopedia itself urge the use of page protection as a response to conflict. We thus might expect protections to lead to a transition to the low-conflict state; and, conversely, that weakening of protection to lead to a transition to the high-conflict state. This happens 80% and 72% of the time, respectively. Interventions are not usually successful in changing a page state, but when they do, their effects *do have the correct valence*. Page protection appears to operate in the direction administrators expect.

Increasing the window increases the number of transitions we can potentially associate with a protection event. When we enlarge the window size to one hundred edits, 397 of the transition events, or 29%, are now associated with a page protection event. The signal is statistically significant ($p < 10^{-3}$), but the false detection rate is higher (240, or 17% expected) and the valence less certain (65% rather than 80%). Post-selecting for the optimal window provides an upper bound: at most, only about 11% of transitions can be reliably explained by page protection events.

Top-down control thus has at best only weak effects on the transition between high- and low-conflict subspace. Given the association between vandalism and the high-conflict subspace, this is surprising. “Locking down” a page may lighten the burden for pro-social users who police vandalism, but the high-conflict subspace describes more than just vandalism, and excluding users—even large classes of them—only rarely induces lasting effects on long-term patterns of cooperation and conflict. Conversely, opening up a page rarely leads to an emergence of new conflict. Most top-down actions are unsuccessful in causing a page transition; most transitions can not be explained by reference to top-down action. Comfortingly, however, when associations can be found, they do have the correct valence. It is unusual for a hard protection event, for example, to be associated with a transition to the high-conflict subspace.

2.2.2. Anti-Social User Events

A transition to the high-conflict state could be occasioned by the appearance of particularly anti-social users. Recall that anti-social users are defined by having an average blocking rate higher than 95% of users who have appeared on the page. Anti-social users are said to “dominate” a transition when they make the plurality of edits within the window in question.

There are a total of 710 transitions to the high-conflict state in our data. Of those transitions, 212 are associated, within 10 steps, with the dominance of an anti-social user, compared to an expected 208 in the null. We do not find above-null evidence of anti-social users triggering a transition ($p > 0.1$). Anti-social user events *do not explain* the transitions we see in the data. Expanding the range to 100 steps leaves the results unchanged: 255 transitions can be associated with an anti-social user event, compared to 263 in the null. Despite a significant focus on the management of problematic users within

⁴ This is less than the total number of transitions, because we do not have reliable records of protection events prior to 10 November 2003.

the encyclopedia [13,21], their appearance at a particular point does not appear to be a proximate cause of conflict.

This high null-expectation rate (35%) implies that a significant fraction of edits—at least on high-traffic pages—are made by users who have received significant numbers of administratively-imposed sanctions compared to their total number of edits. The simple appearance of this kind of user, however, is ineffective in inducing a transition. They seem to play many roles in the system, including roles consistent with the system remaining in the low-conflict subspace, perhaps due to preference change and dynamical learning of social norms [22].

Anti-social users *do not explain* transition events and they are *ineffective* in inducing a transition.

2.2.3. Major External Events

Not all pages are associated with a topic sufficiently newsworthy that external events can be tracked; once we eliminate pages where less than 10% of months have an article during the page lifetime, we are left with a sample of 59 pages.

Epoch transitions associated with external events include George W. Bush's election win in November 2004, Israel's July 2006 conflict in Gaza, Bob Dylan's first number one hit in thirty years in September 2006, and Barack Obama's election win in November 2008 and his inauguration in January 2009. However, many significant news events are not associated with epoch transitions, including the death of Michael Jackson in 2009 (which left other significant traces on the page [14]), and John Kerry's election loss in November 2004.

There are a total of 1,367 transitions that we could potentially associate with newsworthy events. A total of 146 of these transitions are associated (10.6%) with such an event. We expect, on average, 126 events in the null case (9.2%). While there is weak evidence for some above-null association ($p \approx 0.03 < 0.05$), the effect size appears to be small: less than 2% of all transition events can be reliably associated with outlier news-coverage.

Unusual spikes of real world news coverage *do not explain* transition events and, because of the lack of association, we can also assert that they are *ineffective* in inducing a transition.

3. Discussion

The results described here provide novel evidence for the existence of an epoch-like structure of conflict and cooperation on Wikipedia. When we model page-editing as a finite state machine, we find that pages can be trapped in one or another subset of their computational subspaces, often for hundreds of days at a time.

At the most coarse-grained level, this trapping places the system in either a low or high-conflict state. In the high conflict state, we also see an acceleration of activity by a factor of two or more. Subspaces are characterized by more than just overall levels of conflict: they have distinct motifs of interaction, including tit-for-tat (repeated reverting) in the low-conflict subspace, and propose-reject (C then R) and strong signals of vandal repair in the high-conflict subspace.

The epoch structure revealed by our finite state analysis is defined by far more than just the density of reverts. As can be seen in the example time-series Fig. 1, the low-conflict subspace can have long runs

of reverting and edit warring. Low-conflict, in other words, does not mean zero conflict, and, in fact, may even mean norm violation—repeated reverting is likely to violate the “three revert rule” (3RR) that prohibits a single user from making three reverts to a page in a row.

In game theoretic accounts of behavior on Wikipedia, reverts can be likened to “defect” moves, and repeated reverts by different users something we might expect from a tit-for-tat like strategy under noise [16]. The association of long strings of reverts with the low-conflict subspace fits with accounts that put tit-for-tat at the heart of successful resolution of collective action problems from asocial beginnings [23]. The fact that they violate the Wikipedia-specific 3RR norm suggests that this more ancient tit-for-tat strategy may still play an important functional role in managing conflict. Individuals may be banding together: past work on Wikipedia conflict has examined the influence of edit wars that draw in multiple mutually-reverting subgroups, and these more structured interactions may characterize the low-conflict subspace. In the case of edits to the Terri Schiavo page, for example, a network analysis finds three groups of antagonists: one group of administrators, and two groups associated with a particular point of view [24].

The patterns we describe here extend over thousands of edits; our epoch-structure is on a longer timescale than the laws that describe short-term, repeated cooperation on timescales of minutes and hours [15]. It is consistent with findings of the importance of long-term system memory in the bursty structure of edit wars [14,25–28]. Our work goes beyond previous studies to explicitly construct an approximation to the full social grammar of system conflict [11]. Since the number of users far exceeds the number of states, each state is an irreducible coarse-graining of an (implicit) fine-grained, complete account of the mental states of hundreds of individuals acting in a context set by the text on the page itself.

We have chosen a particularly simple computational model for our system—formally, a system at the base of the Chomsky hierarchy [29]. A finite-state machine can, in short runs, approximate more sophisticated grammars, but the pumping lemma (and its simple probabilistic extension) means that, on sufficiently long timescales, it must fail. Indeed, our epoch-like structure already suggests the existence of long-range memory: repeated CR motifs, for example, in one month, correlate with the presence of CR motifs many months later. Examination of the detailed structure of our machines may suggest priors for higher-order grammars, such as the context-free languages that allow for nested pairing.

Another open question concerns the relationship between these simple finite-state models and the epsilon machines [30–32]; while hidden Markov models generically imply infinite-state epsilon machines, recent progress has suggested ways to lossily compress these representations to a finite system [33]. These results currently suggest that, because of the exceedingly small spectral gap seen in Wikipedia, estimating some of the quantities relevant to the computational mechanics paradigm is impossible even for the very longest sequences ($\sim 10^4$ data points) we can observe. However, other recent work in this tradition suggests that, with a sufficiently explicit phenomenological model, estimation of quantities such as excess entropy may be possible [34]. Our current belief is that discovery of these very small spectral gaps suggests that a finite-state machine is only an approximate model, and that the true nature of memory storage and processing is likely to be more interesting yet. Its description may demand novel mathematical structures beyond the simple cases currently found in the quantitative literature.

We examined three *prima facie* plausible mechanisms for switching the system between these two states: top-down administrative actions, the appearance of unusually anti-social editors, and major external events in the real world. In only one case—administrator action—did we find statistically significant associations compatible with a causal role for state-space switching.

One of the characteristics of the high-conflict subspace are motifs associated with vandalism (repeated CR pairs), and part of the explanation of the transition to the high-conflict subspace must involve new sources of this particular behavior. Efforts to exclude anonymous IP addresses, or registered but untrusted users, suggests that administrators are able to recognize sources of vandalism and intervene to prevent them. However, while vandalism is more commonly associated with the high-conflict state, the majority of edits do not show signatures of vandalism, and locking down a page is largely ineffective in shifting the system back to a low-conflict state. Moreover, transitions in (or out) of a high-conflict state are not associated with higher user turnover, and so can not be explained by an unexpected influx of new users.

When we eliminate the CR pattern from behavior associated with the high-conflict subspace, what remains is higher-conflict than expected. It may be that trivially anti-social behavior creates a background noise that makes it harder for the remaining users to maintain social norms that prevent conflict [21].

While we are able to rule out spikes in news coverage as deterministic exogenous drivers, one of the key limitations of our work here is our inability to rule out more complicated interactions with the larger world. Long-term system memory may reside in users, in the text of the page, or well beyond the bounds of the encyclopedia. In the end, Wikipedia is not an isolated system. Its internal logic is coupled to the wider world, one rich in its own bursty and autocorrelated structure, and there is no clear division between the two [35]. It is this joint process we observe and must analyse: a small and shifting fragment of the internet as a whole.

4. Conclusion

Conflict is endemic to social life. Rather than exclude conflict altogether, however, most societies attempt to manage the ways in which conflict and cooperation interact. The co-existence of conflict and cooperation is a basic theme of studies of intra-group conflict in the biological sciences [36,37]. Quarreling and fighting are not simply unstructured forms of letting off steam. They are complex phenomena that make significant cognitive demands on individuals [38,39] and that result in epochs that decouple from day-night cycles and far outlast any particular clash [40,41]. Wikipedia seems to be no exception to regularities we see across the biological world.

Finite-state modeling of Wikipedia's social grammar provides new insight into how individual-level complexity leaves a trace on the system as a whole. In a large-scale, virtual environment, with many tens of thousands of participants drawn from the wider internet, we find that conflict retains a complex logical structure, with context-dependent system memory that means that any particular event must be understood in a wider context that extends many months back, and may help define the system's future years hence. The dynamics of this memory and its associated patterns of conflict, can not be captured by simple top-down accounts.

Our results indicate new points of contact for the mathematical, social, and biological sciences. By measuring the essentially computational properties of a social world—its spectral gap or the logic of its

subspaces—we gain new insight into the ways in which our species can trap itself in the very patterns it creates.

Acknowledgements

I thank Bradi Heaberlin (Indiana University) for reading a version of this manuscript, and the Global Brain Institute of Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium at which this work was presented. I extend special thanks to Nate Metheny (Santa Fe Institute) for the construction of machines Ganesha, Saraswati, and Laxmi that made the calculations in this paper possible.

References

1. May Lim, Richard Metzler, and Yaneer Bar-Yam. Global pattern formation and ethnic/cultural violence. *Science*, 317(5844):1540–1544, 2007.
2. Alex Rutherford, Dion Harmon, Justin Werfel, Alexander S. Gard-Murray, Shlomiya Bar-Yam, Andreas Gros, Ramon Xulvi-Brunet, and Yaneer Bar-Yam. Good fences: The importance of setting boundaries for peaceful coexistence. *PLoS ONE*, 9(5):e95660, 05 2014.
3. Theda Skocpol. *States and social revolutions: A comparative analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge University Press, 1979.
4. Theda Skocpol. *Social revolutions in the modern world*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
5. Marten Scheffer, Jordi Bascompte, William A Brock, Victor Brovkin, Stephen R Carpenter, Vasilis Dakos, Hermann Held, Egbert H Van Nes, Max Rietkerk, and George Sugihara. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature*, 461(7260):53–59, 2009.
6. Steven J Lade and Thilo Gross. Early warning signals for critical transitions: a generalized modeling approach. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 8(2):e1002360, 2012.
7. Vasilis Dakos, Egbert H van Nes, Raúl Donangelo, Hugo Fort, and Marten Scheffer. Spatial correlation as leading indicator of catastrophic shifts. *Theoretical Ecology*, 3(3):163–174, 2010.
8. Vasilis Dakos, Marten Scheffer, Egbert H van Nes, Victor Brovkin, Vladimir Petoukhov, and Hermann Held. Slowing down as an early warning signal for abrupt climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(38):14308–14312, 2008.
9. Rong Wang, John A Dearing, Peter G Langdon, Enlou Zhang, Xiangdong Yang, Vasilis Dakos, and Marten Scheffer. Flickering gives early warning signals of a critical transition to a eutrophic lake state. *Nature*, 492(7429):419–422, 2012.
10. Ingrid A van de Leemput, Marieke Wichers, Angélique OJ Cramer, Denny Borsboom, Francis Tuerlinckx, Peter Kuppens, Egbert H van Nes, Wolfgang Viechtbauer, Erik J Giltay, Steven H Aggen, et al. Critical slowing down as early warning for the onset and termination of depression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(1):87–92, 2014.
11. Ray Jackendoff. *Language, consciousness, culture: Essays on mental structure*. MIT Press, 2007.
12. David Darmon, Jared Sylvester, Michelle Girvan, and William Rand. Predictability of user behavior in social media: Bottom-up v. top-down modeling. In *2013 International Conference on Social Computing (SocialCom)*, pages 102–107. IEEE, 2013.
13. Joseph Michael Reagle. *Good faith collaboration: The culture of Wikipedia*. MIT Press, 2010.

14. Taha Yasseri, Robert Sumi, András Rung, András Kornai, and János Kertész. Dynamics of conflicts in Wikipedia. *PLoS ONE*, 7(6):e38869, 2012.
15. Simon DeDeo. Collective phenomena and non-finite state computation in a human social system. *PLoS ONE*, 8(10):e75818, 10 2013.
16. Simon DeDeo. Group minds and the case of Wikipedia. *Human Computation*, 1(1):5–29, 2014. arXiv:1407.2210. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1407.2210>.
17. William H Press, Saul A Teukolsky, William T Vetterling, and Brian P Flannery. *Numerical recipes, 3rd edition: The art of scientific computing*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
18. G David Forney Jr. The Viterbi algorithm. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 61(3):268–278, 1973.
19. Sara Klingenstein, Tim Hitchcock, and Simon DeDeo. The civilizing process in London’s Old Bailey. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(26):9419–9424, 2014.
20. Simon DeDeo, Robert X. D. Hawkins, Sara Klingenstein, and Tim Hitchcock. Bootstrap methods for the empirical study of decision-making and information flows in social systems. *Entropy*, 15(6):2246–2276, 2013.
21. Bradi Heaberlin and Simon DeDeo. The evolution of Wikipedia’s norm network. arXiv:1512.01725, 2015. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.01725>.
22. Simon DeDeo. Major transitions in political order. arXiv:1512.03419, 2015. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03419>.
23. R Axelrod and WD Hamilton. The evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 211(4489):1390–1396, 1981.
24. Aniket Kittur, Bongwon Suh, Bryan A Pendleton, and Ed H Chi. He says, she says: conflict and coordination in Wikipedia. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, pages 453–462. ACM, 2007.
25. Fernanda B Viégas, Martin Wattenberg, and Kushal Dave. Studying cooperation and conflict between authors with history flow visualizations. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, pages 575–582. ACM, 2004.
26. Róbert Sumi, Taha Yasseri, András Rung, András Kornai, and János Kertész. Characterization and prediction of Wikipedia edit wars. In *Proceedings of the ACM WebSci’11*, pages 1–3, Koblenz, Germany, June 2011.
27. Róbert Sumi, Taha Yasseri, András Rung, András Kornai, and János Kertész. Edit wars in Wikipedia. arXiv:1107.3689, 2011.
28. Taha Yasseri and János Kertész. Value production in a collaborative environment. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 151(3-4):414–439, 2013.
29. Noam Chomsky. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1965.
30. James P Crutchfield and Karl Young. Inferring statistical complexity. *Physical Review Letters*, 63(2):105, 1989.
31. James P Crutchfield. The calculi of emergence: computation, dynamics and induction. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 75(1):11–54, 1994.
32. James P Crutchfield and Cosma Rohilla Shalizi. Thermodynamic depth of causal states: Objective complexity via minimal representations. *Physical review E*, 59(1):275, 1999.

33. Sarah Marzen and James P Crutchfield. Circumventing the curse of dimensionality in prediction: Causal rate-distortion for infinite-order markov processes. *arXiv:1412.2859*, 2014. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.2859>.
34. Sarah E. Marzen and James P Crutchfield. Statistical signatures of structural organization: The case of long memory in renewal processes. *arXiv:1512.01859*, 2015. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.01859>.
35. Nathan Jurgenson. When atoms meet bits: Social media, the mobile web and augmented revolution. *Future Internet*, 4(1):83–91, 2012.
36. Jessica C Flack, David C Krakauer, and Frans BM de Waal. Robustness mechanisms in primate societies: a perturbation study. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 272(1568):1091–1099, 2005.
37. Jessica C Flack, Michelle Girvan, Frans BM De Waal, and David C Krakauer. Policing stabilizes construction of social niches in primates. *Nature*, 439(7075):426–429, 2006.
38. Simon DeDeo, David Krakauer, and Jessica Flack. Inductive game theory and the dynamics of animal conflict. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 6(5):e1000782, 2010.
39. Elizabeth A. Hobson and Simon DeDeo. Social feedback and the emergence of rank in animal society. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 11(9):e1004411, 09 2015.
40. Simon DeDeo, David Krakauer, and Jessica Flack. Evidence of strategic periodicities in collective conflict dynamics. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 8(62):1260–1273, 2011.
41. Jessica C Flack. Multiple time-scales and the developmental dynamics of social systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367(1597):1802–1810, 2012.